

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/071,841
Supplemental Amendment After Final dated March 31, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of November 16, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and continued examination of the above-identified application are respectfully requested.

The amendment to the claims further defines what the applicants regard as their invention. Full support for the amendment can be found in the specification as originally filed as well as the claims, especially claim 10. Therefore, no new questions of patentability should arise nor does the amendment necessitate any further searching on the part of the Examiner. The amendment places the application in condition for allowance. At a minimum, the amendment places the application in a better condition for appeal. Accordingly, no questions of new matter should arise and entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 11-13, and 17-39 are pending in the application. Claim 10 has been canceled by this amendment.

The arguments and comments as set forth in the Amendment After Final filed January 26, 2005 are incorporated in their entirety by reference herein and will not be repeated to avoid excessive paperwork.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner did indicate that claims 17-33 are allowed and that claims 2-13 and 34-39 are objected and that claim 1 is the only rejected claim. The Examiner believes that the support pointed for step a) of claim 1 is for only tantalum and/or an oxide thereof. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants do not agree with the Examiner with respect to this support issue. However, the applicants do point out that claim 10, as originally filed, has very similar language and therefore, the language of claim 10 has been incorporated into claim 1. Claim 10 has been indicated as objected to and therefore contains allowable subject matter. Accordingly, by way of this

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/071,841
Supplemental Amendment After Final dated March 31, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of November 16, 2004

amendment, all claims should be allowed. The undersigned did contact the Examiner on March 30, 2005 to review the above arguments with respect to incorporating claim 10 into claim 1, and the Examiner appreciated these arguments and indicated that he would consider this amendment.

Accordingly, for these reasons, this rejection should be withdrawn.


The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by telephone should there be any remaining issues as to the patentability of the claims in view of the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 03-0060. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and should also be charged to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Luke A. Kilyk
Reg. No. 33,251

Atty. Docket No. 01071 (3600-358)
KILYK & BOWERSOX, P.L.L.C.
53 A East Lee Street
Warrenton, VA 20186
Tel.: (540) 428-1701
Fax: (540) 428-1720